

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action of April 9, 2008. As of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-5, 7-23, and 28-29 were pending, and all claims are rejected. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 28. No new matter is presented.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

A. Nagata or Kundrat in view of Peras

Claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2002/0005089 to Nagata *et al.* (Nagata) or U.S. 5,567,224 to Kundrat (Kundrat) in view of U.S. 3,234,608 to Peras (Peras).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons already of record regarding the teachings of Nagata, Kundrat and Peras. Nevertheless, as Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 28, which claim is not rejected over this combination of references, the rejection is rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

B. Rejections involving Woodfield in view of Shamblen.

Claims 1, 7-15, 17-21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,884,279 to Woodfield *et al.* (Woodfield) in view of U.S. 6,926,754 to Shamblen *et al.* (Shamblen); claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodfield in view of Shamblen as applied to claim 1, and further in view of US. 2002/0003008 to Goecmen *et al.* (Goecmen); claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodfield in view of Shamblen as applied to claim 1, and further in view of JP Publication 192-22788E for JP 57-026153 to Derwent (Derwent); claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

-7-

103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodfield in view of Shamblen as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. 7,033,448 to Groh *et al.* (Groh); and claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodfield in view of Shamblen.

Pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Applicants note that Shamblen is disqualified as prior art because it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and each of Shamblen (Reel/Frame: 014179/0049) and the instant Application (Reel/Frame: 015181/0256) are assigned to the General Electric Company.

Thus, this ground of rejection should also be withdrawn.

C. Double Patenting Rejections.

Claims 1, 7-15, and 18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9-19, and 23 of co-pending Application No. 11/059,715; and Claims 1 and 10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,884,279 to Woodfield in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,926,754 to Shamblen.

In light of the amendment which incorporates the limitation of claim 28 into claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the double patenting rejection is rendered moot and requests it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not rendered obvious in view of the cited art and thus, are in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any fees determined by the Patent Office to be due from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1059.

Respectfully submitted,
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

Dated: July 9, 2008

/Shawn K. Leppo/

Phone: (717) 237-5218
Fax: (717) 237-5300

Shawn K. Leppo
Reg. No. 50,311
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
Attorney for Applicant